ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 6/8/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED000718	8162	

4. AUTHOR(S):
N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Academic Programs Abroad: An Exploration of their Assets and Liabilities

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
N.A.

7. EDITOR(S):
N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Institute of International Edu.
ST. 1 E. 67th Street
CITY. New York 21, N.Y.
TELE. EXT.
INST/LCC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
Institute of International Education

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	N.A.	60	30

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
conference

16. INDEXING TERMS (8-12)

conferences	students	supervision		
curriculum	foreign edu.	evaluation		
higher edu.	programs	foreign languages		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

Due to an awareness of the critical need for better understanding of many aspects of study abroad programs, four organizations (Association of American Colleges, Council on Student Travel, Experiment in International Living, and Institute of International Education) sponsored a series of conferences designed to investigate the problems of study abroad. *Academic Programs Abroad* deals with the conference held at Mount Holyoke College in January 1960.

Significant among the many problems identified and discussed at the conference were: the lack of information and guidance for colleges interested in starting programs, falsely described programs, duplication and overlapping of programs, inadequate academic facilities in non-European areas, and problems pertaining to academic supervision. Problems relating to evaluation of foreign grades and the mastery of the appropriate foreign language by students were also discussed. Although no formal resolutions were adopted by the conferees, 15 specific recommendations emerged.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION

20. DIVISION OR DEPT.

21. CONTRACT NO.

PROJECT NO.

22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT

23. DURATION OR PROJECT

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Education

R-6-21

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

8162

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ABROAD:

AN EXPLORATION OF THEIR ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

REPORT OF A SPECIAL CONFERENCE

MOUNT HOLYOKE COLLEGE, SOUTH HADLEY, MASS.

JANUARY 14-16, 1960

8162

SPONSORED BY:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

COUNCIL ON STUDENT TRAVEL

EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING

INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

ED000718

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ABROAD:

An Exploration of Their Assets and Liabilities

May 1960

Published by:

Institute of International Education

1 East 67th Street

New York 21, New York

50¢ a copy

INTRODUCTION

Since World War II, interest in the academic experience abroad has increased rapidly. Programs have been developing so spontaneously that there have been few opportunities to arrange for the coordination and the planning essential to good organization and proper development. Not until recently have the institutions and agencies which are primarily interested in and responsible for international educational exchanges organized their resources for a unified study of this area of education. The necessity of an immediate study has been proved not only by the excessive number of problems which exist but also by those problems which have begun to appear in larger numbers and in greater depth as additional colleges and universities establish programs.

There is a need for better understanding of many aspects of the programs. We must analyze the goals (both individual and institutional), the standards of evaluation, the criteria for selecting faculty and students, the nature of the administrative problems and the sources and kinds of information available to institutions. Even more important is the need for knowing the educational scene, the attitudes, facilities, curricular and the social, economic and staff problems of the universities abroad. Though certain agencies and organizations such as the Institute of International Education have for many years furnished information on some of the aspects of the experience abroad, no agency, or combination of agencies, has furnished a ready source of information for many of the areas of concern.

In view of the many complexities of this important segment of education, several of the organizations and agencies which have been vitally concerned decided that a series of conferences be held and that these conferences include participants from all over the world.

A committee of representatives from the Association of American Colleges through its Commission on International Understanding, the Council on Student Travel, the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education organized this meeting which was held at Mount Holyoke College on January 14-16, 1960. The meeting, made possible through a grant by the Ford Foundation, was to consider as many of the problems mentioned above as possible and to raise additional questions.

At the Mount Holyoke meeting it was decided that a larger meeting, national in scope, be held in Chicago on October 7 and 8, 1960. It is hoped that this conference will furnish an opportunity for all institutions interested in international educational programs to examine the many facets of the experience abroad.

This report has been prepared by Donald A. Bullard of the Institute of International Education. It is hoped that this report and the background papers and report from the Chicago conference will draw together the invaluable material which will have been discussed at these conferences.

J. Ralph Murray
President
Elmira College

May 1960

ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ABROAD:
AN EXPLORATION OF THEIR ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Introduction and Background

The rapid post-war growth of overseas academic programs for U. S. undergraduates shows that ever greater numbers of American colleges believe that what was once an experience restricted to a limited number of selected students from eastern seaboard colleges is now becoming a general aspect of the educational picture. The growth has been spontaneous and unorganized; it is one of the multiplying international contacts that Americans are making in every field of public and private endeavor. It is pluralistic and enormously varied in level and quality, as befits the American educational tradition. In the course of his studies on the Overseas American, Dean Harlan Cleveland of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University has stated, "It should be a live option for every student at a reputable American college to study abroad for at least one semester under competent supervision and conditions that immerse him in an alien culture."

Pluralism and variety, however, carry with them certain risks and dangers, and these are becoming increasingly apparent. The obvious attractions to the student to obtain part of his undergraduate education in a new environment encourage opportunistic merchandising which does not reflect credit on American higher education. We may be approaching the point where academically questionable programs may overrun the limited resources available in the host nations abroad.

The national agencies engaged in and responsible for international educational exchanges have become increasingly concerned about this situation. A Committee on Academic Programs Abroad was formed at the 1958 annual conference of the Council on Student Travel. In 1959 it

became clear that authoritative and responsible representatives of the academic community should be convened to discuss American undergraduate programs abroad. A planning committee of the four organizations sponsoring the Mount Holyoke conference prepared for this meeting and laid the groundwork for a larger national conference on overseas programs to be held in Chicago in October 1960.

The Institute of International Education, having followed the development of foreign study programs over the past 40 years, in cooperation with the Council on the Junior Year Abroad, made the first organized attempt to measure growth in this field through a survey of college-sponsored programs in 1957, the results of which appear in the Institute's publication, "Foreign Study for U. S. Undergraduates: A Survey of College Programs and Policies."

The Council on Student Travel, whose administrative services, shipboard orientation programs and travel assistance were developed primarily for short-term summer study and travel programs, has been increasingly called upon for help and advice by colleges initiating full academic-year foreign study programs. The Council's conferences in 1958 and 1959 included lively sessions on the administrative and operational programs of academic programs overseas.

The Experiment in International Living has for over 25 years conducted one of the most significant and imaginative exchange programs for college-age students. The program is based on a combination of careful selection of participants and leaders, thorough pre-departure orientation and an extended period of living as part of a family in a community overseas.

The Experiment, which has in recent years entered into cooperative arrangements with many U. S. government and university international exchange programs, obtained

the help of the Ford Foundation in bringing together representatives of national agencies and institutions concerned with the growing movement of American education abroad.

Finally, the Association of American Colleges, representing most of the liberal arts colleges in the U. S., on the recommendation of its Commission on International Relations, agreed to provide leadership and guidance in this increasingly complex situation.

The planning committee of the four sponsoring organizations under the chairmanship of President J. Ralph Murray of Elmira College agreed that a large national conference on American academic programs abroad should be preceded by a smaller meeting of educators and administrators whose task would be to explore the field and to identify those issues and problems that might be discussed fruitfully. It was planned that the meeting would also establish a list of criteria and factors in overseas programs to assist colleges and universities already engaged in, or about to establish, undergraduate programs abroad. President Richard Gettell graciously invited the 40 participants to meet at Mount Holyoke College on January 14-16, 1960.

The Mount Holyoke meeting followed the annual conference of the Association of American Colleges in Boston to permit attendance by a widely representative group of college presidents and administrators. Officials of 31 American institutions of higher education came to the meeting. Also attending were representatives of major public and private agencies such as the U. S. Office of Education, the American Council on Education, the Educational Testing Service, the New York State Education Department, the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange and the Ford Foundation. An important contribution to the discussions was made by four distinguished educators from abroad who were invited to attend the AAC conference and the Mount Holyoke meeting. They were university representatives from Great Britain, France,

Germany and Mexico with particular insight into or responsibility for the problems of American academic programs in their countries. Additional stimulus and focus were given to the Mount Holyoke discussions by the appearance of a challenging and critical book about Junior Year programs, From Main Street to the Left Bank, by Walter Adams and John A. Garraty.

Approximately 40 participants at the Mount Holyoke meeting held general discussions at the beginning and at the end of their two days together. To start the meeting Dr. Eugene Adams of Colgate University assumed the role of "devil's advocate" in an exposition of the many problems and possible negative aspects of organized study abroad. A full day was then devoted to smaller group seminars on: a) objectives and evaluation of overseas academic programs; b) students and faculty; c) program. Reports from these seminars were given orally at the close of the meeting and were reproduced and distributed to the conference participants.

What were the results of these weighty explorations and deliberations? The Mount Holyoke discussions were helpful in pinpointing the areas of concern; later groups approaching this subject will profit by the work of definitions of terms and clarifica n of ideas accomplished in these sessions. Secondly, the seminars and general sessions reviewed and assessed the assets and liabilities, the pluses and minuses, the positive and negative aspects of college-sponsored programs abroad. These, it was found, show themselves most often in specific situations and problems, and each seminar enumerated what it considered the most vexatious problems and, where possible, suggested solutions. Finally, out of the seminars and concluding sessions came an attempt to indicate what general policies and procedures should govern the overseas programs of responsible U. S. colleges and universities.

It was not possible to arrive at definite solutions or infallible criteria within the time limits of this meeting.

Those present however, felt that they were greatly helped by the meeting in their own understanding of the overseas academic effort and that they had gained a clearer view of the principles by which these programs should be operated.

The purpose of this report is to share some of the information and wisdom exchanged at Mount Holyoke College, particularly with those colleges and agency representatives planning to attend the national conference scheduled for October 7 and 8, 1960 in Chicago immediately following the annual meeting of the American Council on Education.

Identifying the Problem

As its field of inquiry the Mount Holyoke meeting focussed on formal programs operated abroad for undergraduate students by U. S. colleges. Summer programs were considered only incidentally. Attention was directed principally to those academic year or semester programs for which academic credit is given. According to the IIE report, "Foreign Study for U. S. Undergraduates," there were approximately 2,500 American undergraduates studying abroad for credit in 1956-57. These included 500 participants in some type of organized junior year abroad programs, 400 undergraduates studying independently and a few holding scholarships. Approximately 1,500 were enrolled in summer courses for which they received regular credit. Of the 688 U. S. colleges which replied to the IIE survey, 120 had organized programs for undergraduate foreign study. By the time the survey was published in 1958, 14 additional institutions had initiated academic programs abroad.

One of the striking features of this foreign study movement is its bewildering variety. The older type of "junior year" for students majoring in languages and arts is no longer typical. New programs are experimental, launching out into unfamiliar geographic areas, developing

unconventional curricula and scheduling the foreign program for various lengths of time in the students' undergraduate careers. For the sake of convenience the IIE report divided existing programs into the four following categories: 1) academic year programs open to undergraduates of several institutions, 2) academic year programs open only to undergraduates of the sponsoring institution, 3) academic year scholarships for undergraduates to study abroad, often on a reciprocal arrangement between the U. S. college and its counterpart overseas, 4) programs whereby institutions permit undergraduates to study abroad independently. The Mount Holyoke meeting refined the identification process and differentiated programs according to the academic and administrative responsibility taken by the sponsoring U. S. college and by the foreign host institution.

In his report from Seminar 3, Dr. Edward Weidner identified the following types of arrangements according to the degree of responsibility taken by the American college or university and the host institution abroad:

1) Study for a regular degree, diploma or certificate granted by the foreign institution.

2) Enrollment in the same courses as the students of the host country but the American students return to their institutions and obtain an American degree.

3) Special courses for foreigners approved by the American university at the host institution.

4) Special programs organized abroad by the U. S. institution hiring teachers from the host country as faculty.

5) American curriculum and faculty abroad -- overseas branches of U. S. institutions.

That the proliferating foreign study programs are not carried out at a consistently high academic level was one of the principle concerns of the Mount Holyoke group. Many programs are not representative of serious higher education in the United States; some do not reflect the standards of the sponsoring American school; others approve and give academic credit for what is in effect an unsupervised Wanderjahr. It is apparently not feasible to evaluate and accredit overseas programs through the American regional accrediting associations, and yet there is a generally recognized need for standards and criteria. As one of the distinguished foreign educators, Dr. James Drever, Dean of the College of Arts at the University of Edinburgh, put it, "The first general conclusion I have about overseas programs is, don't let them develop irrationally, on the theory that the more you have the better they must be. Try first of all, before you have any sort or expansion program, to tidy up what you already have."

Educational Values and Risks of Overseas Academic Programs

The Mount Holyoke conferees found that the positive values, the educational gains, the advantages of overseas programs and, on the other hand, the hazards, risks and perils of such programs are inevitably tied up with the expectations and goals of the sponsoring institutions. What does the college hope to achieve in the education of its students? Is the college convinced that study abroad is the best way to obtain the desired results? The foreign program may be planned as part of the general educational curriculum which is completed in most colleges in the first two years. Or, rather, it may be designed to help the upperclassman specialize more deeply in his chosen field of concentration or academic major. Increased foreign language proficiency is another strong motive in stimulating foreign study programs. Many colleges believe that the students' living abroad and sharing another culture is a highly educational experience in itself, producing

great intellectual growth and maturity. Some colleges believe that American students who will be called upon to shoulder increased international responsibilities in a shrinking world should have a foreign study and living experience as a part of their college program. A few delegates thought that sending American undergraduates abroad to represent our cherished ideas and our desire for friendship and international understanding is justification enough for such programs. What impressed the Mount Holyoke conference was the fact that many programs are set in motion and operated with only the vaguest goals and objectives. It emphasized most strongly and repeatedly that in order to achieve positive values, programs must be based on clear and valid educational aims.

A somewhat different perspective on the values in overseas academic programs was gained from the educators from abroad. Dr. Baier of the University of Munich said, "It always astonishes me that young people are better messengers of good will and humanity than are old professors or politicians." And in another connection he expressed scholarly concern: "Living with families abroad is important but it is not an academic concern. If an academic citizen is studying in a foreign country, he comes as an academic ambassador of his own country."

Dr. Bravo Ahuja of Mexico stressed the value of international contact and friendship: "The most important thing is to understand people... physical things are important but spiritual things are more important; and in order to understand peopie we must understand their language. I consider the best friendship is based on our own knowledge of the personality of our friends." Dr. Drever of Edinburgh pointed out the contribution of American students to the campus abroad: "We are not there to help the poor, provincial, ignorant American student to become properly educated in Europe. We are looking to our American guests to help us, as they do, in the education of our own students." Quite another emphasis was expressed by the

representative of the Ford Foundation, Mr. John Everton, "I see these programs as symptomatic of the deepening involvement of the university in world affairs since the end of the War. I welcome this development on the part of American higher education and particularly its extension to Asian and African areas." Still another point of view and concern was voiced by Dr. Oliver Caldwell of the U. S, Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: "The function of education is changing rapidly. If we are to avoid becoming a second-rate power, American education must keep up. We must be more flexible -- more flexible than we are here. Maintaining pristine purity is not our goal...we must increase the contact of our youth with the rest of the world: broaden, deepen, strengthen our international educational programs."

The hazards and risks of overseas academic programs were summed up by Dr. Eugene Adams of Colgate University, "devil's advocate" at the beginning of the conference. A fundamental hazard, he too agreed, is ambiguous, equivocal or misleading goals. The purposes of these programs must be clearly defined and clearly and publicly stated. Moreover, unless the program is genuinely educational it may be worse than no program at all. The overseas program must be educationally consistent with the sponsoring institution's home curriculum -- at least in level if not in content. Many programs are not representative of the whole academic program of the college, or even of one department of its faculty. Programs of such partial value may constitute a harmful interruption of the undergraduate career and are certainly not worth one quarter one academic year of the students' college career.

Overseas programs, Dr. Adams suggested, are of doubtful value for students majoring in the physical sciences, and few undergraduates in any field of study have sufficient foreign language proficiency to profit from university instruction in another language. Foreign study planned for the first two years of the undergraduate curriculum may deprive the student of fundamental, essential knowledge

which is usually taught at that level. Programs abroad for upperclassmen rarely, even in his major field, give the serious student the instruction, library and laboratory facilities he needs.

There is no such thing as exact measurement of the academic value of overseas study. These programs may rob the campus of potential student leadership and the student of the chance to develop himself through extra-curricular activities and sports. Even well-selected students undergo a "sea change" and may develop socially overseas in a most undesirable way, the result being bad for the student and for the name of American colleges. Students returning from a junior year abroad are often so unable to readjust to U. S. college life that their final and supposedly most important college year is wasted. These are some of the danger areas which Dr. Adams said "could make the mushrooming foreign study program literally turn into an educational scandal."

The accusations and objections of the devil's advocate, though strongly stated, are no exaggeration of the attitude of many American faculty members and college administrators. They are real problems which the conferees at Mount Holyoke were compelled to examine and discuss thoroughly and frankly.

Specific Problems and How to Solve Them

Perils in the foreign study field for undergraduates manifest themselves in terms of specific situations and problems which require action by the student, the instructor, the program director or by the college itself. These problems, inherent, endemic or sporadic in most programs, cropped up repeatedly throughout the general sessions and in each one of the seminars, whether or not they appeared on the agenda. Sometimes the experts were able immediately to suggest a solution for the problem at hand. At other times no effective remedy could be suggested.

Rather than summarize the lengthy discussion of problem areas, it may be more helpful to the reader and those who will participate in the Chicago Conference in October 1960 to list the problems and to indicate very briefly what solutions or recommendations were made at Mount Holyoke. It goes without saying that the following abbreviated listing of the problems does not do justice to the serious and thoughtful examination to which they were subjected.

Specific Problems	Suggested Solutions or Factors to Consider
Lack of information and guidance for colleges interested in starting programs.	A national agency (IIE, AAC or CST) should set up machinery to provide needed information, technical advice and policy guidance.
Falsely described programs.	The sponsoring college should think out and clearly state its educational goals and programs.
Duplication and overlapping of programs.	New programs should be started only if they are needed. Locations should be selected in cooperation with existing programs.
Programs as private, individual projects.	No individual faculty member or department should embark on overseas program unrelated to the college as a whole. Foreign program should be integrated into the overall academic curriculum.
Curriculum uneven in content and quality.	Well-rounded curriculum should be devised for either 1) advanced specialization in major field or 2) general educational background.
Length of program. In what year?	The program should be shaped according to the educational objectives. A semester or a semester plus a summer may be adequate time for some programs. The sophomore year

	has some definite advantages over the junior year for programs emphasizing general education.
Location.	Western European capitals are flooded with programs. Provincial university cities may be preferable and non-European areas explored.
Overcrowding at "name" institutions abroad.	If overseas programs continue to multiply, host institutions may have to restrict enrollment of U. S. students. Is a crowded European university the best answer educationally?
Inadequate academic facilities in non-European areas.	Facilities suitable for U. S. undergraduates may not exist. The U. S. college may have to develop its own academic program in Asian and African areas.
Type of academic supervision.	The supervision of the students is the responsibility of the U. S. institutions. If the program is large enough, it is probably better to use U. S. professors for supervision. Smaller programs can employ professors from the host countries. For some programs, adequate supervision may be had through reports written to the home college.
Evaluation of foreign grades, diplomas and certificates.	The U. S. college must be prepared to evaluate the work

	done by students abroad by its own standards; no outside agency can do this adequately for the individual college. If the overseas program is planned and integrated into U. S. curriculum the problem of accreditation should not exist.
Need of foreign language ability.	Since program objectives usually stress contact with the host culture and if any instruction is to be in host country's language, then a working knowledge of the foreign language is a valid requirement for participation. In certain fields (arts) and in certain areas (Asian and African countries) foreign language competence may be less important.
Selection of student participants.	Academic programs abroad generally involve several dimensions of experience beyond those required on the domestic campus. The selection of students for an overseas program should involve the college or university over and above the screening required for usual freshman admission.
Choosing U. S. faculty.	Program directors and supervisors need to be carefully selected. This should be a responsible job, not a "fringe benefit."

Dubious commercial connections.	Faculty members should not operate study programs abroad as a commercial sideline, or cooperate with agencies run for profit and with no educational interest.
Readjustment problem.	Readjustment problems are minimized if the overseas program is effectively integrated into curriculum at home. Social readjustment may be eased by providing opportunities for returning students to share their experiences with others.
Need for scholarships.	Are academic programs abroad limited to wealthy students? Can U. S. college scholarships be used? Should subsidies be sought for such programs, especially in Asia and Africa where they may be in the national interest?
Total immersion.	Housing arrangements and special contacts should provide for the fullest possible contact with the life and culture of the host country. A shortage of facilities or administrative problems may require separate housing for U. S. groups, but living with families or in dormitories with students of the host country are preferable. Separate housing for the groups

is not recommended.

Evaluation.	In addition to evaluating each student's work abroad, the U. S. college should have a mechanism for evaluating its program as a whole. Is it meeting educational needs? Is it in keeping with the educational goals of U. S. institutions? How do participants compare with stay-at-homes? How should the program be improved?

Although no formal resolutions were adopted by the Mount Holyoke conferees, the Seminar on "Students and Faculty" listed fifteen propositions which were submitted to the conference for consideration. These propositions cover several of the problems listed above and were carefully and thoughtfully drafted by a group of teachers and administrators with long experience in the operations of overseas programs. The suggestions from the Seminar are given below. It is hoped that they may provide expert and authoritative guidance to college officials considering foreign study programs.

1. That an appropriate organization, such as the Association of American Colleges, set up an office, adequately staffed, to provide policy guidance, technical information and overseas assistance.

2. That any institution which contemplates setting up an overseas program be urged to define and state clearly its educational goals and objectives, the age levels it wishes to consider, the size of the program, the needs the program will serve, and how the program's objectives are related to the objectives of the institution itself, and to the objectives of the host institution.

3. That the institution then secure competent and complete information on the operation of the program it contemplates. Such information will pertain to its mechanisms and costs, the fields of study available, the demand for such study and sources of further information in the host country.

4. That no new program be planned or established until it has been determined that there are no similar programs in the same area with which the institution could co-operate, that the need for a new program exists, that it is possible to adapt a program to the circumstances of the host area. Under proper circumstances, co-operation between colleges in these programs should be encouraged.

5. That the institution examine the length of the program, whether the goals are best attained in a full year, a semester, a short-term or a summer. The institution should also study carefully the timing of the proposed program, whether best in the freshman, sophomore, junior or senior year, or post-graduate years for the fullest achievement of the goals.

6. That it be recognized that, in general, shorter terms of foreign study are better suited to "general education" goals, while the longer terms of a year or more are better suited to advanced study and technical specialization.

7. That a well-conceived and carefully-structured program of foreign study at the undergraduate level does not constitute an interruption of study but is an

integrated part of the student's four-year experience. The student's previous studies should give him the proper preparation and orientation; his studies after his return should be so geared to the foreign program that he will derive full satisfaction and profit from the foreign experience. Problems of adaptation and re-adaptation should thus be reduced to a minimum.

8. Since experience in another culture demands more of both student and faculty than a domestic campus program, the institution must define and tenaciously enforce the standards of quality for the program. The average American college or university student is in the upper 30-40% (intellectually) of his age group while in most other areas of the world higher education is limited to the upper 5-10% of a given age group. A high degree of selectivity is necessary to secure comparable student quality. It must also be kept in mind that the need for a superior student increases with the degree of independence and the degree of professional and technical advancement.

9. That the criteria of selection should include intellectual capacity, seriousness of purpose or motivation, good character, demonstrated potential for social adjustment and a basic understanding of the United States and of the host country. Above all, and with rare exception, the student should possess an adequate working knowledge of the language of instruction in the foreign country -- in terms of understanding, speaking, reading and writing.

10. That in operating a program, the sponsoring

institution accepts responsibility for adequate supervision of the program and official evaluation of the students' work, and vouches for its validity for academic credit. The institution is thus committed whether the supervision is done by personnel in the host institution or by personnel sent by the sponsoring college. Use of American personnel is more justifiable for administration than for instruction.

11. That the selection of the Director or Supervisor of the overseas program is of the utmost importance. He should be a leader and an example for the group, fluent in the foreign language, familiar with the civilization and customs of the host country and well acquainted with the educational organization of the United States and of the host country. He should possess a dynamic, warm and understanding personality. He should be adequately paid. An overseas program should not be treated as a fringe benefit to be passed around among unqualified faculty members on the basis of expediency.

12. That as a general rule it does not seem necessary or wise to export instruction, that is, to send American faculty members overseas to teach in these programs. There is little immersion in the foreign intellectual environment if the student merely works with a transplanted American faculty, without the library and laboratory facilities available in the United States. U.S. educators planning foreign study programs should also realize that in addition to the universities in the host nation there are many types of advanced institutions -- technical, professional and even

general -- which in the United States would be classified as colleges and that many of these institutions would be interested in working with American students and institutions.

13. That academic credit toward a degree not be granted unless the program is officially sponsored by an institution, and unless there is a bona fide program of serious study with final examinations comparable to the usual resident college program.

14. That colleges should warn their faculty members of the danger of being victimized by irresponsible travel organizations.

15. That serious consideration be given to the possibility of operating study programs in other languages and areas than those of Western Europe and Latin America. The countries of Asia, Africa and the Middle and Far East are vital in America's educational planning.

Unfinished Business: Policy Guide-lines for the Future

The two days of debate at Mount Holyoke covered many matters of general policy and many of the problems attendant on the overseas programs. Time did not permit the exhaustive examination of every important aspect of foreign study programs, nor did the conferees feel it incumbent on them to arrive at a set of hard and fast rules for the conduct of overseas study programs.

In preparation for the meeting at Mount Holyoke, the agenda listed 42 basic questions for the three Seminars. Most of these questions were discussed -- some in great detail others only briefly, and there were few definitive

answers. The agenda of the Mount Holyoke group is just as valid now as it was on January 14, 1960, and is therefore appended to this report.

On the basis of their detailed discussions at Mount Holyoke there was no attempt to prophesy what future developments in this field might be or what direction the movement might take. It must be stated that, like most other conferences, this meeting did not produce any answers or remedies. In modern fashion there was an area of agreement on most matters of principle. It was agreed that the study abroad movement is growing "like Topsy" and that American colleges must take a look at this phenomenon and its implications. Basically, the group agreed that academic programs abroad may be valid and desirable both from the point of view of education per se and in fostering better international understanding and relations. The importance of such programs in furthering the national interest by producing a significant number of Americans with foreign area and language experience was acknowledged.

The appearance of seemingly chaotic, confused programs was recognized as a spontaneous reaction to a need on the part of American students and educators to broaden the horizon of undergraduate education beyond the U. S. campus more tangibly than through curriculum change and expansion. This uncoordinated proliferation of overseas programs, whether desirable or not, was viewed as the product of individual initiative of persons and institutions, and, as such, was found to be undisciplined, uncontrolled and typically American. It was agreed that, given the pluralistic and independent nature of U. S. higher education, it would not be possible to control effectively the numbers and kinds of overseas programs through any one central agency or authority.

There was a general feeling, however, that American educational institutions could work through their member organizations and professional associations and the national agencies toward the general acceptance of desirable

standards for international undergraduate programs. The conference welcomed the leadership and assistance of the federal agencies concerned with foreign affairs and education (U. S. Departments of State and Health, Education, and Welfare) in this effort, and recommended that the private organizations in this field (Institute of International Education, Council on Student Travel, Experiment in International Living) establish a central clearinghouse of information and provide the administrative services necessary to the proper functioning of organized programs. The conference recognized, furthermore, that the Association of American Colleges would play a vital role in helping to establish desirable standards for overseas undergraduate programs. The Association could exert great influence toward making the foreign study movement a regular and respectable part of the American college program rather than a marginal activity of sometimes doubtful educational value.

Existing programs are heavily concentrated in the traditional centers of learning in Western Europe, and more good overseas undergraduate programs should be organized in Latin America, in Asia and in Africa. At all times, it was stressed, U. S. -sponsored programs should be aware of their responsibilities toward the host country and toward the institutions receiving American undergraduates. Tuition costs for students at most foreign institutions are largely absorbed by the tax-payers of the countries concerned; limited academic facilities abroad run the risk of being overtaxed by the influx of American students. U. S. institutions admit only a restricted number of qualified foreign students to their campuses, so American undergraduates sent abroad should be selected with equal care. The conference stressed that public attention should be drawn to the need for improvement of these overseas study programs. In summation, the conference warned against any development that could lead to the impairment of the standards of American education or to the deterioration of our relations with other countries. The Conference ended with the hope that its examination of the issues and its statement of concerns would help bring order and self-discipline to this fast-growing child of American higher education.

APPENDIX I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Adams, Arthur S.
President, American Council on Education

Adams, Eugene T.
Dean of the Faculty, Colgate University

Armacost, George H.
President, University of Redlands

Blanding, Sarah Gibson
President, Vassar College

Bolling, Landrum R.
President, Earlham College

*Bowman, John E.
Executive Director, Council on Student Travel

*Boyce, F. Gordon
President, The Experiment in International Living

Caldwell, Oliver J.
Assistant Commissioner for International Education, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Coffman, William E.
Director, Test Development Division, Educational Testing Service

Cook, Donald B.
Staff Director, U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State

Degginger, Stuart H. L.
Associate Professor of English, Hollins College

Diller, George E.
Professor of French
Dartmouth College

Dixon, James P.
President, Antioch College

Everton, John Scott
Associate Director, International Training and Research Programs, Ford Foundation

Fasmacht, Harold D.
President, La Verne College

Fountain, Dr. Gerard
Acting Dean of the College,
Sarah Lawrence College

Freeman, Stephen A.
Vice President, Middlebury
College

Frese, The Reverend Joseph R.
Director, Honors Program,
Fordham University

Friedman, Julian R.
Director of the Graduate
Overseas Training Program,
Syracuse University

Gettell, Richard Glenn
Conference Chairman,
President, Mount Holyoke
College

Granskou, Clemens M.
President, Saint Olaf
College

Granskou, Mrs. Clemens M.

Leonard, Mrs. Elizabeth W.
Assistant Professor of Education and Director of
Foreign Study and Travel,
Adelphi College

Mendenhall, Thomas C.
President, Smith College

*Murray, J. Ralph, Chairman, Planning and Organizing Committee,
President, Elmira
College

Nyquist, Ewald B.
Associate Commissioner,
State Education Department, The University of
the State of New York

Pannell, Mrs. Anne Gary
President, Sweet Briar
College

Patterson, Gardner
Director, Woodrow
Wilson School of Public
and International Affairs,
Princeton University

Rapport, Victor A.
Dean, Wayne State
University

Seibert, Russell H.
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Western
Michigan University

*Shank, Donald J.
Executive Vice President,
Institute of International
Education

Stevens, Mrs. Alice C.
Acting Academic Dean,
Mount Holyoke College

Stone, Donald C.
Dean, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh

Stone, Ivan M.
Dean of the College, Beloit College

*von Klemperer, Lily
Head, Information and Counseling Division, Institute of International Education

*Wallace, John A.
Vice President, The Experiment in International Living

Weidner, Edward W.
Director, Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University

* Wormald, F. L.
Associate Director, Association of American Colleges

Young, Herrick B.
President, Western College for Women

Guest Educators from Foreign Countries

Ahuja, Victor Bravo
Sub-Minister of Education, Technical Division, Government of Mexico

Baier, Walther
Professor of Veterinary Medicine, University of Munich

Drever, James
Dean of the College of Arts, University of Edinburgh

Henry-Greard, Rene
Secretaire General, Institut d'Etudes Politiques

* Members of the Planning and Organizing Committee.

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

Seminar A -- Objectives and Evaluation

1. Should the overseas programs have specifically stated goals which are different from, in addition to or varying from the broad goals of the institution?

2. Are there possible conflicts between the institutional goals and the individual student's goals?

3. What are the goals of the cooperating or host institutions and of the individuals overseas?

4. To what extent should goals be stated so as to limit the area of participation, selection and program?

5. Are the objectives of an overseas program a matter of faculty concern, administrative concern or trustee approval?

6. To what extent will questions 1 through 5 vary among institutions conducting their own programs and those whose students participate in programs sponsored by other institutions?

7. To what extent are sponsoring institutions evaluating carefully the results of their overseas programs in terms of stated goals?

8. Do the regional and professional accrediting associations accept without question any

overseas program sponsored by an accredited institution?

9. What responsibility does the non-sponsoring institution have to counsel its foreign-bound students?

10. What are the aspects which should be considered in evaluating the quality of an overseas program?

11. To what extent should the reactions and opinions of the overseas hosts be a factor in evaluating a program?

12. Is it desirable to consider a more formal evaluation or accreditation of such programs by some such agency as the Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel or the Institute of International Education?

13. Is there evidence that these overseas programs are worth not only the cost in dollars, but also their cost in terms of disruption to the normal four-year academic program?

Seminar B -- Students and Faculty

1. Are these opportunities more or fewer abroad for U.S. undergraduate or graduate students?

2. Should there be a selection and screening beyond that required for the normal academic program on campus?

3. Are there greater advantages in an overseas program late during the formal higher education period or is it best offered to freshmen or sophomores?

4. Should these programs be limited to those who can speak the language of the host country?

5. Is there evidence available that overseas programs have greater value for students in specific fields?

6. What are the advantages of a single-institution program vs. those programs which accept students from other institutions?

7. What are the problems of readjustment to the home campus? How are they being solved?

8. Is the overseas program a fringe benefit for faculty members?

9. To what extent should colleges encourage faculty members to organize and operate independent programs or those promoted by travel organizations?

10. Are we insulting the overseas institution and its faculty when we import our own faculty members to their campuses?

11. Should additional criteria be established when a permanent faculty member is considered for appointment overseas?

12. Should overseas assignment be paid at the same rate as on-campus instruction? What about expenses?

13. Is it important for faculty members to have foreign language fluency?

Seminar C -- Program

1. Is there a correlation between measured outcome and length of time spent overseas?

2. To what extent should popular demand govern the overseas locale? Do we run the risk that all our programs be in Paris, London and Florence -- and none in Karachi, Cairo or Santiago?

3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the following types of programs?

   a. Study tour
   b. Registration and attendance at a foreign institution
   c. A U.S. campus overseas
   d. Independent study programs
   e. Combined American-foreign faculty

4. Are there any standards for the academic credit offered by the sponsoring institution?

5. What are the merits of departmental vs. interdepartmental programs?

6. To what extent should language requirements govern the type of program offered? Is there justification in sending a non-foreign-language-speaking student into a non-English-speaking area?

7. What fields may be served best by an overseas program -- languages, social studies, science and math, literature, fine arts, archaeology?

8. To what extent should program be governed by U.S, degree requirements instead of the

curricular organization of the overseas institutions?

9. Are there possible ways of correlating the U.S. academic calendar with the educational calendar abroad?

10. What are the ideal housing priorities -- hotel, dormitory, family, hostel or pension?

11. Should an overseas student pay the same tuition as one on campus?

12. In view of the high cost of transportation, is it economically feasible to operate programs of less than a year's duration?

13. Should scholarship students -- especially those with working scholarships -- retain their grants while overseas?

14. Should an overseas program be expected to cover its entire operational cost from student charges or be subsidized to the same extent that most on-campus instruction is subsidized?

15. How much of a voice should be given to the overseas hosts in the planning of overseas programs? How much influence would we ask for if the direction of the programs were reversed?